

09/13/88

METRO PERMIT FACT SHEET

Date: August 30, 1988

Company: Lone Star Industries

USEPA SF



1270091

Is permit a renewal, new, or a revision? Renewal

How company came to Metro's attention: Our first contact was in Dec. of 1969 when the company contacted Metro for information on the disposal of waste waters to Metro. This permit is partly due to the fact that DOE will only accept a portion of the surface water from this site. The company is currently remodeling the site for their purposes as well as for environmental reasons. The goal of the company is to improve the site to the point that a permit is not necessary.

Permitted industrial volume: 60,000 gpd

Nature of business and types of wastes generated: Waste water from the washdown of concrete delivery trucks and from contaminated surface waters.

Category of discharge limits: Metro general limits

Permit drafted by: Ray Carveth

Date application received: See special comments

Date permit fee paid: The company has now determined the fee was paid to the wrong place. Their finance department apparently sent the money to the Seattle sewer department and they now have a very large credit on their sewer bill. We have reissued the bill and they are in the process of paying it. *Turned out they were wrong; they actually paid the bill under the name of Lone Star Industries*

Date draft permit issued: July 13, 1988

Date public comment period completed: Comment period for the application ended on August 13, 1988

Comments received from: The company and the department of Ecology on the draft permit.

* Company comments dealt with minor rewording in the pretreatment section and a minor change to the compliance schedule dates.

* The Department of Ecology comments dealt with addition of cautionary language for surface water runoff, sample site description, further sample type description and changing the Metro limits for Cadmium, Chrome and adding an upper pH limit. I have responded to all of the comments except the changes to our limits. ~~This change is a policy issue that is currently being discussed by DOE and Metro. To apply the changes prior to the completion of those discussions would be arbitrary and unfair to the company.~~

I have signed permit but do not send until you brief me on this - what specifically did DOE want on Cd & Cr? Have they agreed to our limits or not?

*Insert
Attaches*

JBL

13
Sept 7

Date permit was ready for issuance: August 31, 1988. See note in permit fee section.

Special Comments: This permit was extended to August 31, 1988 in order that the company and the new Japanese partners could come to agreement on the remodeling and pretreatment plans for this site. This process has been completed and the company has already started the remodeling phase. The new Japanese partners have been pursuing pretreatment technology in Japan and have suggested a system that may improve the waste water to the point it can be recycled into the product. The goal of both the company management and Metro is for the company not to have a discharge to us.

Pollution reduction :

Solid Waste; currently the residual solid material from this operation is hauled to a construction waste landfill. The cost for this process for the month of July is listed below:

4255 tons of material was taken to the landfill. Cost per ton. \$4.75

Cost \$ 20,211.

To meet the moisture content requirements of the landfill 602 tons of raw material had to be added to the waste prior to taking it to the landfill. The per ton cost for the raw materials is \$5.50.

Cost \$3,311

***** Total cost for July \$23,522 *****

This figure does not include labor or transport costs.

By installing pretreatment to dewater these wastes the company will not have to add raw materials to dry them. This will save the company the cost of the raw materials (\$3,311) and the cost of disposing of this extra poundage (602 tons @ \$4.75 per ton = \$ 2,859) Total savings \$ 3,311 + \$ 2,859 = \$ 6170. They would like to use the dried wastes as construction site fill and further reduce their disposal costs.

Liquid Wastes:

The water regained from the dewatering of this waste is to be reused at the site reducing the volume of water purchased by the company. Until the company makes the final decision on the type of pretreatment equipment they will purchase it is impossible to tell what the volume will be.

NOTE

The goal of the company is to restructure the site to the point that they will save on costs and not need a Metro permit. With the costs currently being incurred they have a major incentive to pursue this issue.

~~Page 0~~

~~As discussed on~~ insert

As agreed in a meeting on August 10, 1988 between
Ellie Nulsgin and Doug Helderbrand of MRS and
Nancy Winters and Doug Knutson of Ecology, MRS
cannot change its local limits without going through
proper procedures and a formal adoption process. The
issue of change to our local limits to ~~be~~ be
consistent with hazardous waste limits, will be
dealt with as part of a local limit review process.